

REMARKS

I. INTRODUCTION

In response to the Office Action dated April 8, 2005, claims 1, 2, 14, 27 and 28 have been amended. Claims 1-39 remain in the application. Entry of these amendments, and re-consideration of the application, as amended, is requested.

II. PRIOR ART REJECTIONS

In section (5) of the Office Action, claims 1-39 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Plantz et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,088,702 (Plantz) in view of Doherty, 'Project-Specific Web Sites', Interiors, March 1998, Vol. 157, Issue 3.

Applicants' attorney respectfully traverses these rejections.

The Office Action asserts that Plantz teaches most of the limitations of Applicants' independent claims. However, the Office Action admits that Plantz fails to explicitly disclose architectural project information, which includes drawings, documents, communications, and tasks related to the architectural projects. Nonetheless, the Office Action asserts that Doherty teaches a means for accessing architectural project information using an interactive web site hosted on a server. Thus, the Office Action asserts that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Plantz and Doherty before him at the time the invention was made, to modify the collaborative environment methods taught by Plantz to include the architectural information of Doherty, because it would have extended the project information control of multiple users in the implementation of an interactive collaborative web site. Further, with regard to an application programming interface (API), the Office Action asserts that the internet access and data retrieval methods of Plantz inherently utilizes a generic WinSock API (as shown by the Mitchell reference) when accessing the internet and the communications methods utilizing TCP/IP communications.

Applicants' attorney disagrees. The cited references, individually or in combination, do not teach nor suggest all of the various elements of Applicants' independent claims.

As noted previously, Plantz merely describes a web-based Group Publishing System (GPS) for permitting coordinated publishing, assembly and administration of texts. However, nowhere does Plantz describe an application programming interface (API), as recited in Applicants' claims, having a plurality of procedures that provide for an organization of containers for storing, managing and sharing files for one or more architectural projects, and that allow an application program

executed by the client computer to access architectural project information stored across the internet on a server site. Indeed, as admitted by the Office Action, Plantz does not disclose accessing architectural project information

Similarly, Doherty merely describes the use of project-specific web sites for interior design firms. However, nowhere does Doherty describe an application programming interface (API) having a plurality of procedures that provide for an organization of containers for storing, managing and sharing files for one or more architectural projects, and that allow an application program executed by the client computer to access architectural project information stored across the internet on a server site.

The Office Action's argument that Plantz inherently utilizes a generic WinSock API as described in Mitchell is unpersuasive.

First, Applicants' attorney objects to the Office Action's use of the Mitchell reference, since Mitchell is not properly cited in the rejections, and because Mitchell is not prior art to Applicants' invention. Consequently, Applicants' attorney requests that this portion of the rejection be withdrawn.

Second, the Winsock API of Mitchell relates only to networking. In Applicants' claims, on the other hand, the API has a plurality of procedures that provide for an organization of containers for storing, managing and sharing files for one or more architectural projects, and that allow an application program executed by the client computer to access architectural project information stored across the internet on a server site. None of the references teach such an API.

In addition, the Office Action improperly uses hindsight when combining Plantz, Doherty and Mitchell, and fails to establish a prima facie case of obviousness. Specifically, there is no suggestion or motivation implicitly or explicitly in the references themselves that the references could be combined in the manner suggested by the Office Action, or that the combination teaches all the limitations of Applicants' claims. the Office Action. Instead, any suggestion to modify the references is made solely by the Office Action itself.

Thus, Applicants' attorney submits that independent claims 1, 14, and 27 are allowable over the references. Further, dependent claims 2-13, 15-26, and 28-39 are submitted to be allowable over the references in the same manner, because they are dependent on independent claims 1, 14, and 27, respectively, and thus contain all the limitations of the independent claims. In addition, dependent claims 2-13, 15-26, and 28-39 recite additional novel elements not shown by the references.

III. CONCLUSION

In view of the above, it is submitted that this application is now in good order for allowance and such allowance is respectfully solicited. Should the Examiner believe minor matters still remain that can be resolved in a telephone interview, the Examiner is urged to call Applicants' undersigned attorney.

Respectfully submitted,

GATES & COOPER LLP
Attorneys for Applicants

Howard Hughes Center
6701 Center Drive West, Suite 1050
Los Angeles, California 90045
(310) 641-8797

Date: June 8, 2005

By: 

Name: George H. Gates

Reg. No.: 33,500

GHG/bjs